



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

II.—*A New Source in Plutarch's Life of Cicero.*

BY DR. A. GUDEMAN,

NEW YORK.

Two modes of philological investigations have of recent years risen into high favor. The one, which may be termed the *statistical* method, consists in carefully and minutely examining the style of some Greek or Roman author, usually with a view to determine the chronology of his works or to settle questions regarding their authenticity. Dealing only with documentary evidence, this method proceeds on perfectly safe lines, the only danger which it constantly incurs being a kind of irresistible tendency to sweeping inferences, based upon coincidences often, indeed, remarkable.<sup>1</sup> The other method, that of "*Source Researches*," rests on no such firm foundation, the *loss* of the *original* sources being, in fact, the *conditio sine qua, non* of its existence. The question with which this paper is concerned belongs to this latter category of philological inquiry and is more immediately confined to Plutarch's *Life of Cicero*.

I need hardly expatiate upon the great difficulties necessarily involved in researches of this nature, a fact made emphatically apparent by the utter lack of unanimity so frequently displayed by scholars, in the conclusions at which they have arrived. The intrinsic difficulty of the subject and an ever-present element of uncertainty, are, however, I conceive, not the only reasons for this deplorable state of affairs. It is also due, in no small measure, to the undeniable fact that philologists too often enter upon their task with preconceived opinions and without having previously ascertained their author's method and style of work by a diligent perusal of his writings, a demand perhaps never so frequently disregarded as in the case of Plutarch.

He was a most voracious reader, with a keen, absorbing interest

<sup>1</sup> Cf. e.g. *Dittenberger* (Hermes, XVI. p. 321 sqq.), *Schanz* (Hermes, XXI. 439 sqq.), *Ritter*, Untersuchungen über Plato, Stuttgart, Kohlmann, 1888; *Hussey*, On the Verbs of Saying in Plato, Proceed. of Am. Ph. Ass. 1889; *Roquette De Xenophontis vita*, Diss. Regimont, 1884. See also *Zeller's* criticisms, Arch. f. Gesch. d. Philos. II. p. 665, 676 sqq.

in every branch of human knowledge ; and it was his habit to take notes of what he read or heard, either with a view to the composition of some particular treatise, or perhaps merely for the sake of future reference and use. His erudition is encyclopaedic, and in his works he would draw freely upon this vast thesaurus of fact and anecdote, marshalling them into literary phalanxes, as would best suit his purpose.

But, while the characteristics and typical traits in Plutarch's biographical writings are the direct result of his literary skill and his historical method,<sup>2</sup> influenced though they were by the limitations imposed upon him by nature, we can properly estimate the *value* of his biographies only by the authenticity of the sources consulted. Where these were few, he naturally followed the one that appeared to him the more copious and best adapted to his purpose. If, however, the material at his disposal was as superabundant as was unquestionably the case in the Life of Cicero, he had to exercise his faculty of criticism and discrimination to no small extent if he desired, as he professedly did,<sup>3</sup> to give an *impartial* and *truthful* picture of his hero. To ascertain how near Plutarch came to realizing this cherished aim, unbiassed investigations into the sources whence he drew his information are absolutely necessary. The mere assumption of some one particular source, because of real or alleged coincidences between it and Plutarch's narrative, is quite gratuitous and unwarranted as long as the *probability* of some intermediate source remains, for Plutarch did not at all times have access to the *original* sources for the information which he imparts. He may well have taken, and in innumerable instances demonstrably did take, his facts *at second hand*, which does not, however, necessarily render the testimony given either worthless or even less in value, unless demonstrated to be so on other grounds. A quotation, therefore, from some author now lost, or a striking coincidence with some work still extant, does not necessarily imply that the writer had the original, from which the words are taken, before his eyes.

To determine this, we must, in the first place, carefully inquire in each and every instance, whether other passages in Plutarch will warrant us in ascribing to him a *personal* knowledge of the particular

<sup>2</sup> Alex. 1 sqq. (οὕτε γὰρ ἱστορίας γράφομεν ἀλλὰ βίους, etc.); Pericl. 1, 7, 13; Timol. c. 1; Cato Mai. c. 7; Galba 2; Fab. Max. 16; Pomp. 8; Artaxerxes c. 8; Nicias 1; Arat. 1; Demet. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Thes. 1; Cimon. 2; Cat. Min. 37; de Herod. malig. c. 5; de gloria Athen. c. 3.

work under discussion. If so, the further question arises, whether the two apparently similar accounts do not harbor discrepancies and differences of a nature that would make it impossible for us to believe that a writer, possessing the unquestioned ability of a Plutarch, can possibly have made use of certain portions of his "Quelle" and then suddenly have had recourse to some other authority, while completely overlooking or purposely ignoring an entirely different, though perhaps equally truthful version in the author just abandoned by him. I may explain my meaning by an example. In Plut. *Cic.* VI. 15 sq. 'S. we read the following :

Ἐπὶ τοῖτοις οὖν μέγα φρονῶν εἰς Ῥώμην βαδίζων γελοῖον τι παθεῖν φησι. Συντυχὼν γὰρ ἀνδρὶ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν φίλῳ δοκοῦντι περὶ Καμπανίαν, ἐρέσθαι, τίνα δὴ τῶν πεπραγμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λόγον ἔχουσι Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ τί φρονοῦσιν ὡς ὀνόματος καὶ δόξης τῶν πεπραγμένων αὐτῷ τὴν πόλιν ἅπασαν ἐμπεπληκώς τὸν δ' εἰπεῖν· "Ποῦ γὰρ ἦς, ὦ Κικέρων, τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον"; τότε μὲν οὖν ἐξαθυμῆσαι παντάπασιν, εἰ καθάπερ εἰς πέλαγος ἀχανὲς τὴν πόλιν ἐμπεσὼν ὁ περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγος οὐδὲν εἰς δόξαν ἐπίδηλον πεποιήκεν κ.τ.λ.

As this anecdote is not found elsewhere, except in *Cicero's* speech *pro Plancio* (26, 63 sqq.), this oration has always been looked upon as the source of Plutarch. This assumption is, however, altogether erroneous, as will be readily admitted on comparing the passage just quoted with the original :

"Vere me hercule hoc dicam : sic tum existimabam nihil homines aliud Romae nisi de quaestura mea loqui; excogitati quidam erant a Siculis honores in me inauditi, itaque hac spe decedebam ut mihi populum Romanum ultro omnia delaturum putarem. At ego cum casu diebus iis itineris faciendi causa decedens e provincia Puteolos forte venissem, concidi paene, iudices, cum ex me quidam quaesisset quo die Romae exissem et num quidnam novi. Cui cum respondissem me e provincia decedere, 'Etiam, me hercule,' inquit, 'ut opinor ex Africa.' Huic ego iam stomachans fastidiose 'Immo ex Sicilia' inquam. Tum quidam quasi qui omnia sciret, 'Quid? tu nescis hunc quaestorem Syracusis (!) fuisse.'"

Now Plutarch was, as is well known, a passionate lover of anecdote, nor could any one tell a good story more delightfully than he ; and yet we are asked to believe that this clumsy and pointless account, differing also in *essential* details from the original, is the direct reproduction of the exquisitely well-told story just quoted from Cicero ! But if Plutarch can never have read this anecdote in Cicero himself, it certainly is no rash inference to maintain that he in all likelihood never read a line of this speech, let the alleged coincidences between

it and certain parts of the Greek narrative be what they will. The same may be predicated of the orations against Catiline which are generally supposed to have been known to Plutarch. Such similarity, however, as apparently exists between the two accounts, is in no sense surprising, rather perfectly natural, as it almost necessarily arises from both authors treating one and the same well-known historical occurrence. By a similar process of reasoning which seems never to have been resorted to before, we are enabled to eliminate a number of other writings of Cicero commonly supposed to have been known to the Greek biographer.

In the discussion of Plutarch's *Roman Lives* still another problem presents itself, which must at least be touched upon before we can enter upon the more immediate object of this paper. The question is simply this: Are we justified in attributing to Plutarch a sufficient knowledge of Latin that would have enabled him to read the innumerable authors whom he *expressly quotes*?<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *C. Acilius*, Rom. 21; *M. Porcius Cato*, Cato Maior (17 times), Comp. Arist. et Cat. 5, Quaest. Rom. 49; *L. Capurnius Piso*, Numa 21; *C. Fannius*, Tib. Gracch. 4; *Sempronius Tuditanus*, T. Flam. 14; *Scipio Nasica*, Aem. 15. 21; *C. Gracchus*, Tib. Gracch. 8; *Rutillius Rufus*, Mar. 28, Pomp. 37; *Q. Lutatius Catulus*, Marius 25 sq.; *Claudius* (Quadrigarius?), Numa 1 (ἐν ἐλέγχῳ χρόνων); *Valerius Antias*, Rom. 14, Numa 22, Flam. 18, de fort. Rom. 10; *Sallustius*, Lucull. 11. 33; comp. Lys. et Sullae 3. *Cicero* — *Letters*: Pomp. 62 (= ad Att. I. 12, 3, cf. also ad fam. V. 2. 6); *Cic.* 24 (de Dem. ad Herodem et ad filium, de Gorgia ad filium et altera ad Pelopem Byzantium, cf. ad fam. XII. 16. 2; XVI. 21. 6); *Cic.* 35 (ad Caelium, cf. ad Att. XIV. 5. 1; ad fam. II. 11); c. 36 (= ad Att. VIII. 7. 2), c. 40, Praecept. ger. rep. 27 (= ad fam. IV. 13); *Cic.* c. 37 (sed cf. ad Att. VII. 17. 3). *Orations*: Crass. 13; Caes. 4; *Cic.* 24 (Philippics, cf. also c. 48, Ant. 6. 9); c. 35 (pro Murena, cf. also Cato 21; comp. Dem. et Cic. 1); comp. Dem. et Cic. 1 (pro Caelio); *Cic.* 37 (pro Ligario), cf. c. 10–23 orations against Catilina. *Other works*: Aem. c. 10 (= de divin. I. 46, 103; II. 40, 83); Cato Maior 17; Flam. 18 (= de senect. 12, 42); Lucull. 42 (Academica); Crass. 13 (περὶ ὑπαρέλας); Caes. 3, 54; *Cic.* 39 (laudatio Catonis); *Cic.* c. 40 (philosophical works). Cf. also Phoc. 3; *C. Gracch.* 1 (= de div. I. 56); Cato Min. c. 50; *Cic.* 2; comp. Dem. et Cic. 2 (cedant arma togae, etc.). *Tiro*, *Cic.* 41, 49. *Nepos*, comp. Pel. et Marc. 1; Marc. 12, 30; Tib. Gracch. 21; Luc. 43. *Brutus*, *Cic.* 44, 45; Brut. (13 times). *Caesar*, comp. Pel. et Marc. 1; Pomp. 63; Caes. 2, 3, 22, 54; Cato Min. 46, 52, 54; *Cic.* 39. *Asinius Pollio*, Caes. 46; Pomp. 72. *Sulpicius Galba*, Rom. 17. *Tanustius Geminus*, Caes. 22. *Calpurnius Bibulus*, Brut. 2, 13, 23. *Volumnius*, Brut. 48, 51. *Munatius Rufus*, Cato Min. 25, 36, 37. *Livius*, Cam. 5 (cf. Livy V. 21); Marc. 11, 30 (lib. XXVII. 27); comp. Marc. 1 (lib. XXVII. 2, 12); Flamin. 18; Cato Maior 17 (lib. XXXIX. 42); Flamin. 19 (lib. XXXIX. 51); Sulla 6 (ex lib. LXXVII. deperdito); Lucull. 28, 31 (ex lib. LXXXVIII. dep.); Caes. 47 (ex lib. CXI. dep.), 63 (ex lib. CXVI. dep.); Q. R.

On the strength of a famous chapter in the life of Demosthenes (c. 2), it has been answered in various ways. We are there told that he did not begin the study of Latin till late in life, and that he acquired a knowledge of the language by a method most unique and quite incredible, for "it was not so much by the knowledge of words that I came to the understanding of things, but by my experience of things, I was enabled to follow the meaning of words . . . and so in this *fifth* book of my Parallel Lives, in giving an account of Dem. and Cicero, my comparisons of their natural dispositions and their characters will be formed upon their actions and lives as statesmen, and I shall not pretend to criticise their orations one against the other, to show which of the two was the more charming or the more powerful speaker. . . ."

If I rightly interpret this interesting passage, Plutarch does not wish to be understood as saying that he was unable to read Latin intelligently, for he distinctly implies the contrary; but he simply tells us in his modest way that he did not sufficiently master the language of the Romans to constitute him a competent critic of the respective merits of Dem. and Cicero as *orators*, and I am persuaded that every reader will rise from the perusal of his works with the very strong impression that Plutarch certainly possessed a very fair acquaintance with Latin prose writings. But while this must be admitted, it will be seen that the real problem is not whether Plutarch could read Latin authors, *for such sources as he did consult in his Roman biographies were in any case written in that language*,<sup>5</sup> but whether the information which he imparts was taken *directly* from the writers whom he expressly cites as his authorities, or if not quoted by name, as is but too often the case, may be reasonably supposed to point to some one particular work possibly accessible to him. The case of Plutarch's alleged indebtedness to Livy is a good instance. His name occurs some *fourteen* times in Plutarch, the quotations extending from *book V. to book CXVI.*, not counting a number of

25; de fort. Rom. 13 (Livy V. 37 sqq.). Varro, Q. R. 2, 4, 5, 14, 27, 90, 101, 105; Romul. 16. C. Oppius, Pomp. 10; Caes. 17. Q. Dellius, Ant. 59. Corvinus, Brut. 40, 42, 45. C. Drusus, Tib. Gracch. 2. Fenestella, Q. R. 41; Crass. 4; Sylla 28 [*P. Thrasea Paetus ex Munatio*, Cato 25, 36]. Cluvius Rufus, Q. R. 107; Otho 3. Iul. Secundus, Otho 9. Augustus, comp. Dem. et Cic. 3; Cic. 45; Brut. 27, 41; Ant. 22, 68. Valerius Maximus, Marc. 12 (= V. 6); Brut. 53 (= IV. 6. 5 K.); [Γαῖος τις πέλων, ἀνὴρ ἰστορικὸς] Mar. 35. Empulius, Brut. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Barring a few exceptions, such as the memoirs of Lucullus and of Sulla, and Cicero's *ὑπόμνημα τῆς ὑπαρέλας*, which were all written in Greek.

coincidences with this history, where Livy is not especially cited. I do not see how the apparently exhaustive knowledge of Livy here displayed can be accounted for except on the supposition that Plutarch actually read, to use the words of Martial (XIV. 190), "Livius ingens, quem mea non totum bibliotheca capit"! But as this is an intrinsic improbability, and in as much as there is no evidence of an epitome of Livy existing in Plutarch's time, to which all his quotations might in that case be easily referred, we are forced to the conclusion that Livy was solely known to the Greek historian through the medium of other works which he consulted.<sup>6</sup> But if this is the conclusion which an unprejudiced inquiry must lead to, on the face of Livian passages yet *extant*, the temerity of the attempt so constantly made to establish *without the aid of strong collateral evidence*, an interdependence between Plutarch and such of Livy's books as are now unfortunately *lost*, will be plainly apparent.

Again, to take the case of *Cicero*, we contend, that there is scarcely a passage quoted by Plutarch from this writer of a nature to necessitate the assumption of direct indebtedness, for nearly all of these references are either too vague or too general, if not actually contradictory, or the discrepancies too far counterbalance apparent coincidences, to be compatible with a personal acquaintance on Plutarch's part with the works apparently referred to. And then, does it not stand to reason that the biographer, when he had determined to write up the great orator's life, would not, like a modern Drumann, have gone through the voluminous works of Cicero for his materials, even though every single work of his, thanks to the egregious vanity of the man,<sup>7</sup> fairly teems with autobiographical detail.

Of the orator's writings which were professedly autobiographical, the titles of five have come down to us, the ὑπόμνημα τῆς ὑπατείας (*ad Att.* I. 19, 10; I. 20, 6; II. 1, 1; *Plut. Caes.* 8; *Crass.* 13; *Cassius Dio* 46, 21), the *same* in Latin prose (*ad Att.* l.c.; cf. also *Schol. Bob.* p. 270, Or.; "epistula ad Pompeium non mediocriter ad instar voluminis scripta"), a *poem de consulatu*, in three books

<sup>6</sup> This inference is confirmed by a comparison of the passages themselves. Thus, *Plut. Cam.* 5 sq. cannot well have been taken *directly* from Livy, notwithstanding the very direct reference found in our texts (Λίδιος or Λίβιος δέ φησι). Cf. also *Plut. Marc.* 30 with Livy XXVII. 28 (Λίβιος) and many others.

<sup>7</sup> What the poet Horace, in a famous passage (*Sat.* II. 1, 35), said of Lucilius applies with equal force to Cicero: "qui velut fidis arcana sodalibus olim credebatur libris . . . quo fit ut omnis votiva pateat veluti descripta tabella vita senis."

(Urania, Minerva, Calliope),<sup>8</sup> *a poem de temporibus suis* (*ad Quintum fratrem* III. 1, 24 ; III. 9), and finally a work usually designated as *De consiliis suis* (cf. Asc. *Ped.* p. 831 Or. ; Cassius Dio 39, 10 and perhaps alluded to in Plut. *Crass.* 13, ἐν τινι λόγῳ . . . οὗτος μὲν ὁ λόγος ἐξεδόθη μετὰ τὴν ἀμφοῖν [Crassus and Caesar] τελευτήν. Charisius *G. L.* I. 146 ; Boeth. *de inst. mus.* I. 1. Identical with the Ἀνέκδοτα so frequently mentioned in Cic. letters to Atticus II. 6, 2 ; XIV. 14, 5, etc.).

The four last were unquestionably not consulted by Plutarch ; the first has, however, been generally regarded as the principal source of the narrative of Catiline's conspiracy (ch. 10-23). It is not the object of this paper to enter upon a discussion of this question, about which quite a literature has already clustered,<sup>9</sup> nor am I disposed to deny that the Greek account may be based upon Cicero's ὑπόμνημα, but this concession does not necessarily involve the further admission of Plutarch's *direct* indebtedness, for the identical chapters of the ὑπόμνημα may well have been reproduced in Tiro's<sup>10</sup> exhaustive biography of his patron and friend, a work generally conceded to have constituted one of Plutarch's principal authorities ; and yet we are expected to believe that the moment he had reached this part of his narrative, he suddenly abandoned his author, taking recourse to the identical fountain whence Tiro himself drew all his information !

<sup>8</sup> A few fragments still remain ; cf. de div. I. 17-22. Two verses in this poem have gained considerable notoriety, owing to the frequent attacks made against them. *Cedant arma togae*, etc. (Quint. IX. 4, 41 ; Plut. Comp. Cic. 2 ; also quoted by Cic. de off. I. 22, 77, in Pis. 30, and o fortunatam natam me consule Roman, cf. Iuv. X. 124).

<sup>9</sup> Heeren, de fontibus, etc., Plutarchi, 1840, p. 133 sqq. *I. G. Lagus*, Plutarchus vitae Ciceronis scriptor, II. p. 71 sqq., Helsingfors, 1846. *Sibinga*, De Plut. in vita Cic. fontibus, etc., Diss. Leyden, 1863 (pp. 47-143). *Weissäcker*, Jahrb. f. Phil. III, p. 417 sqq. *Besser*, De coniurationes Catilin, Diss. Leipzig, 1880. *E. Schmidt*, De Cic. commentaris . . . a Plut. in vita Cic. expresso Lübeck (Diss. Iena) 1884. *Thouret*, De Cicerone, Asinio Pollione, etc., Diss. Leipzig, 1878 (= Leipz. Stud. I. 313 sqq.). *K. Buresch*, Comment. philol. in honorem Ribbeckii, Teubner, 1888, p. 219 sqq.

<sup>10</sup> A phrase in Plut. Cic. c. 14, 10 s. seems, indeed, to point to a *Latin* source, for we there read 'πραγμάτων καινῶν ἐπιεμένους.' But this is an evident translation of the well-known Latin idiom, 'rebus novis studere.' There is *no parallel Greek* passage, for the νεωτέρων πραγμάτων ἐπιθυμεῖν (ποιεῖν) to be found in Her. Lys. Thucyd. Isocr. is in no way analogous, though perhaps identical in thought, for the invariable use of the *comparative* constitutes the very essential difference between the two expressions. That the ὑπόμνημα of Cicero is not responsible for this Latinism is shown by Ep. ad Att. I. 19, 10.



These introductory remarks concerning the methodical lines, upon which source inquiries must proceed, if the results attained are to possess any validity at all, were deemed necessary (a fact which may possibly excuse their prolixity) for our present purpose. The tendency to rash inferences is the ever-present danger which can only be avoided by our approaching the subject "sine ira et studio," and by not allowing the "wish to be father to the thought." Our conclusions must be the outcome of cogent argumentation; and if the fragmentary state of our knowledge should at any point not yield any satisfactory results, if we can only, in the words of Cicero, "rivulos sectari fontes rerum non videre," then let us frankly say so, and not cover the weakness of our position (to wit, a recent paper on Plutarch's Cicero) by apodictic assertions and a profuse display of rhetorical pyrotechnics.

We have observed that Plutarch's acquaintance with Cicero's writings was probably not so extensive as some scholars would have us believe. But even if this were not so, it would still be perfectly self-evident, from the *vita* before us, that the great orator's works did not constitute Plutarch's only source of information. I do not propose to enter upon the treatment of these sources here,<sup>11</sup> but shall confine myself, for purposes of brevity no less than for the sake of clearness, to those portions of the Greek biography which deal with the personal and literary side of Cicero, as distinct from the political. I shall, therefore, not discuss Plutarch's alleged indebtedness to Livy, Sallust, or Asinius Pollio; for these writers, from the very nature of their histories, confined themselves to a more or less exhaustive narrative of Cicero's political activity, purely biographical detail being wholly beside the object they had in view. Nor, again, shall I inquire into the sources of Plutarch's account of the *death* of Cicero. For this tragic episode, appealing as it did so strongly to the minds of men, was very frequently depicted by historians and often chosen as a theme of discussion by rhetoricians.<sup>12</sup> The accounts possibly accessible to Plutarch were, consequently, so numerous that any attempt to determine his *fons primarius*, at least in the present fragmentary state of our knowledge, will necessarily be doomed to failure at the very outset.

Of the *monographical* literature on Cicero, so far as known to us,

<sup>11</sup> The author of this paper will shortly publish a critical edition of the *Lives* of Dem. and Cic., with a complete 'source commentary.'

<sup>12</sup> Cf. the famous VII. Suasoria of the elder Seneca.

which carefully recorded all purely biographical details, while in no way neglecting his political history, scholars have been well-nigh unanimous in assuming Tiro's *Life of Cicero*<sup>13</sup> as constituting one of the chief sources of Plutarch. This biography was unquestionably of the very greatest authenticity, for not only was this life-long friend of the orator and the editor of his priceless correspondence in possession of absolutely all available material (cf. Gellius VI. (VII.) 3, 8), but he was also enabled to record many incidents derived from their original fountain, the living lips of Cicero himself, as is again attested by a passage in Gellius IV. 10, 5; cf. also XV. 6, 2.

There existed yet another biography of Cicero by a contemporary writer, which, strange to say, has never even been suggested as a possible source of Plutarch. I refer to the *vita Ciceronis* by *Cornelius Nepos*, a work which, if extant, cannot but have proved of the very greatest interest and value, for as the friend of Cicero and Pomponius Atticus, and himself possessed of a very profound knowledge of Roman history, he must have enjoyed most exceptional advantages and facilities for this task. For the solitary mention of this book, we are indebted to the following passage in Gellius *N. A.* XV. 28, 1, which must be quoted in full, as it will engage our attention again :

"Cornelius Nepos et rerum memoriae non indiligens et M. Ciceronis *ut qui maxime amicus familiaris* fuit. Atque is tamen in *librorum primo* quos de vita illius composuit errasse videtur cum eum scripsit tres et viginti annos natum primum causam iudicii publici egisse Sextumque Roscium parricidii reum defendisse. In qua re etiam *Fenestellam*<sup>14</sup> erasse Pedianus Asconius (no doubt in his

<sup>13</sup> This work is mentioned twice by Plutarch himself (ch. 41, 49), also by *Tacitus*, Dial. 17, and Gellius IV. 10. 5; and from *Asconius Pedianus* in Milon, p. 49, Or., we glean the additional information that in his *fourth* book Tyro had not yet advanced beyond the Clodian episode! This same writer was also the *reputed* author of a book, *de iocis Ciceronis*, to which Plutarch was possibly indebted for the numerous 'bon-mots' of the orator found in the *vita* (cf. *Quint.* VI. 3, 5, "utinam Tiro libertus eius aut *aliquis quisquis fuit qui tres hac de re libros edidit*, parcius dictorum numero indulisset." Again, *Quint.* VIII. 6, 73, Ciceronis est in quodam ioculari libello). Also quoted, but as a genuine work, by *Macrobius*, Saturn. II. 1, 12, and *Schol. Bob.* in Sest. p. 309, Or. Another collection of Cicero's "facete dicta" was made by *C. Trebonius*, cf. Cic. ad fam. 15, 21, 1 sqq.

<sup>14</sup> We know next to nothing of the works of this accurate writer (according to Hieronymus, he died 19 A.D., a septuagenarian. Cf. Teuffel, R. L. § 259). From the passages from Asconius, however, quoted by Gellius, and from four others still extant (in Pis. p. 1, in Mil. p. 32, in tog. cand. p. 85, 86), I should infer that F. had given a complete *chronological table* of Cicero's writings (in the "Annales"?), perhaps with short exegetical notes; cf. Asconius in Pis. p. 5, Or.

lost commentary to that oration) animadvertit quod eum scripserit sexto vicesimo aetatis anno pro Sextio Roscio dixisse. Longior autem Nepotis quam Fennellae error est nisi quis vult in animum inducere Nepotem *studio amoris et amicitiae adductum amplificandae admirationis gratia* quadriennium suppressisse ut M. Cicero orationem florentissimam dixisse pro Roscio admodum adulescens videretur."

This accusation of partiality was probably occasioned by the apologetic and eulogistic character of Nepos' narrative, a supposition confirmed by a fragment preserved in the so-called codex Gudianus 278 (Peter, *Fragm. hist. Rom.*, p. 223).<sup>15</sup>

It will have been observed that all the authors that have hitherto been thought of as possible sources of Plutarch's *Life of Cicero* were either contemporary with the orator or very nearly so. It seems not to have occurred to any one that there are passages in this very *Life* that clearly and unmistakably point to a later origin, passages that can never have emanated from *Tiro* or *Nepos* or any other contemporary writer possibly accessible to the Greek biographer; or, in other words, it can be shown that Plutarch also consulted some one or more *post-Augustan* authorities. Having shown this to be true, beyond possible refutation, we shall proceed to prove that one of these sources, if, indeed, there were more, was no other than *Suetonius Tranquillus* in his *vita Ciceronis*, which formed, as is well known, a part of his famous work, *De viris illustribus*.

In order, then, to prove the *first* proposition, that *among the sources of Plutarch's Cicero there was also a post-Augustan writer*, we take the closing paragraph of ch. 2, which reads as follows:

"καὶ τι καὶ ποιημάτων ἔτι παῖδός αὐτοῦ διασώζεται Πόντιος Γλαῦκος, ἐν τετραμέτρῳ πεποιημένον. Προῶν δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ καὶ ποικιλωτέρῳ ἄπτομενος τῆς περὶ ταῦτα μοῦσης ἔδοξεν οὐ μόνον ῥήτωρ ἀλλὰ καὶ ποιητὴς ἄριστος εἶναι Ῥωμαῖον. Ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τῇ ῥητορικῇ δόξα μέχρι νῦν διαμένει καίπερ οὐ μικρὰς γεγενημένης περὶ τοὺς λόγους καινοτομίας, τὴν δὲ ποιητικὴν αὐτοῦ, πολλῶν εὐφῶν ἐπιγενομένων παντάπασιν ἀκλεῖ καὶ ἄτιμον ἔρρειν συμβέβηκεν."

<sup>15</sup> "Cornelius Nepos in libro de historicis Latinis de laude Ciceronis: non ignorare debes, unum hoc genus Latinarum litterarum adhuc non modo non respondere Graeciae sed omnino rude atque inchoatum morte Ciceronis relictum. Ille enim fuit unus, qui potuerit et etiam debuerit historiam digna voce pronuntiare, quippe qui oratoriam eloquentiam rudem a maioribus acceptam perpoliverit, philosophiam ante eum incomptam Latinam sua conformavit oratione (cf. Plut. Cic. 40). ex quo dubito interitu eius utrum res publica an historia magis doleat." — "Locuples ac divina natura quo maiorem sui pareret admirationem ponderatiora-

That this piece of literary criticism is not the intellectual property of the biographer, as far as its essential details are concerned, will not, I am persuaded, be seriously denied by any student of Plutarch. He was at best but an indifferent judge, even of Greek verse, and of Roman poetry he does not seem to have even the slightest acquaintance, no mention being made by him of any Latin poet, throughout all the voluminous writings that have come down to us.<sup>16</sup>

But if this criticism is not Plutarch's own, it can only be attributed to some other *post-Augustan* author for the following reasons: In the first place, we draw attention to the words μέχρι νῦν διαμένει and ἔτι διασώζεται, which clearly indicate some contemporary source consulted by the biographer. In the second place, the very contents of the passage under notice bear strong internal evidence of its post-Augustan origin, for the highly unfavorable verdict which is here passed upon the poetry of Cicero did not begin to be accepted till the second

que sua essent beneficia, neque uni omnia dare nec rursus cuiquam omnia voluit negare."

<sup>16</sup> This may seem a rash statement to make in the face of the well-known mention of *Horace* in *Lucull.* ch. 39. This passage, however, is a most palpable interpolation; so palpable, in fact, that I am astounded at its never having been taken for such before. A juxtaposition of both passages will make this clear:

Στρατηγού δέ ποτε φιλοτιμουμένου περί θέας καὶ χόρυφ τινι κόσμον αἰτιουμένου πορφυρᾶς χλαμύδας ἀπεκρίνατο σκεφάμενος ἂν ἔχη, δώσειν, εἴτα μεθ' ἡμέραν ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁπόσων δέοιτο, τοῦ δὲ ἑκατον ἀρκέσειν φήσαντος, ἐκέλευσε λαβεῖν δὲς τοσαύτας, εἰς δὲ καὶ Φλάκκος ὁ ποιητῆς ἐπιπεφώνηκεν ὥς οὐ νομίζει πλοῦτον οὐδὲ μὴ τὰ παρορώμενα καὶ λανθάνοντα πλείονα τῶν φαινομένων ἑστί.

*Hor. Epist.* I. 6, 40 sqq.

chlamydas, Lucullus, ut aiunt  
si posset centum scaenae praebere rogatus  
'qui possum tot?' ait, tamen et quaero  
et quot habebo,  
mittam? post paulo scribit sibi milia  
quinque.  
esse domi chlamydim, partem vel tolleret omnis.  
exilis domus est ubi non et multa supersunt  
et dominum fallunt et prosunt furibus.

The two versions are widely different, that of Plutarch containing a number of details that could not possibly have been suggested by the passage in Horace, and the "ἐπιφώνημα" can only be made to correspond with the moral which the Latin poet gives to the story by the most liberal kind of interpretation. It is, moreover, very awkwardly and quite unexpectedly joined to the preceding. The anecdote is complete without it, as it is not given by Plutarch with any didactic purpose, as in the case of Horace. The words "εἰς . . . ἑστί" simply represent the marginal gloss of some ancient reader, which subsequently crept into the text.

half of the first century of our era, as will be seen from the following passages :

*Seneca enc. controuv. 3, praef. 8*: Ciceronem eloquentia sua in carminibus destituit. *Seneca de ira* III. 37, 5: et Cicero si derideres carmina eius inimicus esset. Cf. also Gell. N. A. XII. 2 (*Seneca frag. 111, H.*). *Tacitus* Dial. 21: fecerunt enim et carmina et in bibliothecas retulerunt non melius quam Cicero sed felicius quia illos fecisse pauciores sciunt. *Quintil.* XI. 1, 24: in carminibus utinam pepercisset quae non desierunt carpere maligni. *Martial* II. 89, 3: Carmina quod scribis Musis et Apolline nullo | Laudari debes. Hoc Cicerónis habes. *Iuvenal* X. 124: ridenda poemata. Cf. also vs. 122. *Schol. Bob.*, p. 306 *Or.*<sup>17</sup>: Manifestum est amatorem poeticae rei Tullium fuisse quamvis ad oratoriam qua maxime praestitit non videatur in versibus par sui fuisse.

Now all these authors are not only post-Augustan, but practically contemporary. There is no instance of an earlier writer who spoke thus disparagingly of Cicero's poetical productions. This fact cannot be accidental. Again, we may safely assert that neither Nepos, nor Tiro, nor Varro would have handed down to posterity any such verdict, even if convinced of its truth. The only other author to whom we might be disposed to attribute a similar criticism is the impartial *Fenestella* († 19 A.D.) ; but unfortunately, even if this were not a mere supposition, there is not the slightest evidence or probability of any kind that Plutarch ever read any of his works, although he quotes him three times (cf. note 2).

Plutarch's indebtedness to some post-Augustan author having been thus demonstrated, we may now, resting on this firm foundation, proceed to show that Suetonius' *vita Ciceronis* constituted one of these sources.

To accomplish this object, we must briefly discuss the sources of *Hieronymus* and *Sextus Aurelius Victor*.

The former of these need not occupy us very long, for if there is one thing recognized by scholars as an irrefutable fact, it is, that the items concerning Roman literature, found in Hieronymus' <sup>18</sup> additions to the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, are, up to a certain date, all taken from *Suetonius Tranquillus, De viris illustribus*.

<sup>17</sup> This scholiast, although a Christian of the fifth century, is here quoted, because he very largely *Asconii* "fontibus hortulos suos irrigavit." Cf. *Madwig*, De Q. Asconio Pediano, etc. Kopenhagen, 1828, p. 142.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. his own preface, p. 3 Sch., and *Mommsen*, Quellen der Chronik des H. Abh. der sachs Ges. d. W. 1850 (I. p. 669 sqq.). For his historical notices, H. is chiefly indebted to Eutropius, whose principal source was Livy.

Under the name of *Sextus Aurelius Victor* (an historian living in the time of Theodosius about the middle of the fourth century) there have come down to us, among other writings, two works entitled *Caesares* and *De viris illustribus*.<sup>19</sup> Without attaching too much importance to the *singular* coincidence in the titles of these works with those of *Suetonius*, which is in itself suggestive of interdependence, it may be sufficient to draw attention to the fact that the author of the *Caesares* demonstrably did draw very freely upon the *Caesares* of his great predecessor. The presumption, therefore, is that the *De viris illustribus* of Suetonius was also well known to Victor. But whatever may have been the sources of the *De viris illustribus*, a question which could not be discussed in this place without far transgressing the limits imposed upon this paper, I contend, that, at least, as far as the life of Cicero is concerned (which constitutes chap. 81 of his work), he is resting upon the shoulders of Suetonius' *vita Ciceronis*. For not only is there a remarkable family likeness between chap. 81<sup>20</sup> and the lives of some of the Roman poets that have been justly attributed to Suetonius, however diluted they may have been by subsequent accretions, but also because of certain parallelisms between Victor and Suetonius-Hieronymus.

1. *Hieron. Olymp.* 168, 3 (2).

Cicero Arpini nascitur matre Helvia,  
patre equestris ordinis ex regis Volscorum genere.

*Sext. Aurel. Vict. de vir. ill.* 81.

M. Tullius genere Arpinas patre  
equite Romano natus, genus a Tullo rege  
duxit; cf. also *Sil. Ital.* VIII. 404 sqq.

<sup>19</sup> I am perfectly well aware that the *De viris illustribus* has been assumed by many as having been falsely ascribed to this author, owing to its difference in style and treatment as compared with the *Caesares*. I do not, however, think that *Opitz* (*Quaest. de S. A. V.*, *Acta soc. phil. Lips.* II. 2, p. 197-280) or *Wölfflin* (*Bursian, Jahresber.*, 1874, p. 790 sqq., also *Rh. Mus.* 29) or *Haupt* (*De auct. de vir. ill. libr. quaest. histor. Diss. Wurzb.* 1876) have proven their case, except to their own satisfaction, for not only does the *De viris illustribus* bear unmistakable traces of having been *thoroughly epitomized*, but we are not even certain but that the *Caesares* have been similarly dealt with, which, if true, would satisfactorily explain the difference in style and treatment detected by Wölfflin and others. H. Hildesheimer *De libro qui inscribitur de viris ill. etc.* Berlin Diss., 1880, has not been accessible to me.

<sup>20</sup> In its abundant use of participial constructions this chapter has perhaps retained a reflex of its original source, such constructions being very characteristic of Suetonius.

## 2. Hieron. Olymp. 175, 1.

Roscio contra Chrysogonum defenso  
Cicero Athenas *secessit* et inde post  
triennium Romam regressus.

*Sext. Aurel. Vict. de vir. ill.* 81.

Adolescens Rosciano iudicio eloquen-  
tiam et libertatem suam adversus Sulla-  
nos ostendit ex quo veritus invidiam  
Athenas studiorum gratia petivit.

Hieron. Olymp. 184, 2<sup>21</sup> = Aurel. Vict. 81 (Formiis).

To these passages may also be added : *Sueton.* p. 318, 4 R. (= *Sext. Aurel. Vict. de vir. ill.* 2) ; id. p. 319, 2 (= id. 3, 2) ; id. p. 320, 5 (= id. 5, 1, 7).

We see, therefore, that the notices concerning Cicero to be found in *Hieronymus* are *certainly* based upon Suetonius' *De viris illustribus*, while those in Victor's *vita* may, without temerity, be attributed to the *same source*.

Keeping these facts constantly in mind, we may now turn to the discussion of the *third* chapter in Plutarch's biography, a narrative, by the way, so perfectly uniform in color and so perfectly coherent, that we must needs attribute the *entire* passage under notice to *one and the same source*.

Ἐν δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ (*i.e.* when “Σύλλας ἐκράτησε καὶ κατὰστασίν τινα λαμβάνειν ἔδοξεν ἡ πόλις”) Χρυσόγονος ἀπελεύθερος Σύλλα προσαγγείλας τινὸς οὐσίαν ὡς ἐκ προγραφῆς ἀναιρεθέντος αὐτὸς ἐωνήσατο δισχιλίῳν δραχμῶν. Ἐπεὶ δὲ Ῥώσκιος ὁ υἱὸς καὶ κληρονόμος τοῦ τεθνηκότος ἡγανάκτει καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν ἀπεδείκνυε πεντήκοντα καὶ διακοσίῳν ταλάντων οὐσαν ἀξίαν, ὅτε Σύλλας ἐλεγχόμενος ἐχαλέπαινε καὶ δίκην πατροκτονίας ἐπῆγε τῷ Ῥωσκήϊ, τοῦ Χρυσογόνου κατασκευάσαντος, ἐβοήθει δ' οὐδεὶς, ἀλλ' ἀπετρέποντο τοῦ Σύλλα τὴν χαλεπότητα δεδουκότες, οὗτ' αὖ δὲ ἐρημίαν τοῦ μειρακίου τῷ Κικέρωνι προσφυγόντος οἱ φίλοι συμπαρώρμων, ὥς οὐκ ἂν αὐτῷ λαμπροτέραν αὐθις ἀρχὴν πρὸς δόξαν ἐτέραν οὐδὲ καλλίῳ γενησομένην. Ἀναδεξάμενος οὖν τὴν συνηγορίαν καὶ κατορθώσας ἐθανύμασθη, δεδιὼς δὲ τὸν Σύλλαν ἀπεδήμησεν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, διασπείρας λόγον, ὡς τοῦ σώματος αὐτῷ θεραπείας δεομένου.

This passage contains two *errors*. The first consists in the statement that the oration *pro Roscio Amerino* was the earliest speech of Cicero, whereas this distinction belongs to the *oratio pro Quinctio*.<sup>21a</sup> Now it so happens, that the single and solitary reference to Nepos

<sup>21</sup> Hieron. Olym. 184, 4, “Cicero ut quibusdam placet interficitur in Caietis” is an interpolation; cf. *Mommsen*, *Hermes* XXIV. p. 399.

<sup>21a</sup> Cf., however, *pro Quint.* I. 4, “quod mihi *consuevit* in ceteris causis esse adiumento.”

and Fenestella, as authorities on the life, or rather writings, of Cicero (in the passage of Gellius quoted above) was called forth by the existence of this very error. What then, it might be argued, could be more plausible than that Nepos (for Fenestella is out of the question) and not Suetonius, as we contend, was the source of Plutarch's information on this point. But this view, however plausible it may appear at first sight, must be altogether abandoned, because of the *second error* alluded to. "*Fearing the anger of Sulla, he left for Greece*, giving out that the poor state of his health made his departure necessary."

This statement flatly contradicts the facts of history, for so far from leaving Rome out of any dread of Sulla, Cicero actually remained in the city almost a year and a half before taking his trip to Greece, delivering in the mean time at least two speeches, one for L. Varenus (cf. Drumann, V. p. 245) and another in behalf of a woman of Arretium (cf. *pro Caecina* 33, 97, and *ad Att.* I. 19, 4).

It must be perfectly evident that no such account can possibly have been found in Nepos; but if so, Plutarch's source for this chapter which, as I was careful to point out, is of a perfectly homogeneous character, must be sought elsewhere. Nor would Tiro or Varro or Fenestella, or any other writer of the time have been guilty of what is both an insult and a deliberate falsehood, even supposing all their writings to have been accessible to Plutarch, which they unquestionably were not. This calumny, in other words, and with it the entire passage, can only have proceeded from some post-Augustan writer, when a legendary halo had already formed about the historical individual, and many incidents in the great orator's life had become obscured by the lapse of time. This writer I contend was *Suetonius*.<sup>22</sup> For singularly enough *both of the errors* just discussed reappear in *but two other authors besides Plutarch, and in only two*, and these are *Hieronymus* and *Sextus Aurelius Victor*. But inasmuch as the fountain, whence these writers drew this *rare* piece of

<sup>22</sup> That we are doing no injustice to *Suetonius* in ascribing to him the passage under discussion is clearly shown by a most remarkable parallelism found in *Suet. Caes.* 4: "*Ceterum composita seditioni civili Cornelium Dolabellam consularem et triumphalem repetundarum postulavit; absolutoque Rhodum secedere statuit et ad declinandam invidiam et ut per otium et requiem Apollonio Moloni clarissimo tunc dicendi magistro operam daret.*" All the circumstances here afford a perfectly exact parallel to the narrative of Plutarch, and the motive given for the departure is as similar to the above as it is singularly false.



erroneous information was *Suetonius*, it "follows as the night the day" that he constituted the common source of all three. This conclusion, although irresistible, as it appears to me at least, receives additional emphatic confirmation from the fact that the statements under notice, apart from the circumstance that they are found but three times in all extant literature, are also demonstrably *erroneous*, it being well known how much safer a clue to the detection of literary interdependence is frequently afforded by *errors* found in common than by coincidences in matters of fact, the treatment of the same subject often leading to a similarity in its presentation.

In ch. I we seem to detect another instance, almost equally certain, of Plutarch's indebtedness to Suetonius :

Κικέρωνος δὲ τὴν μὲν μητέρα λέγουσιν Ἑλβίαν καὶ γεγονέναι καλῶς καὶ βεβιωκέναι, περὶ δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ἦν πυθέσθαι μέτριον. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐν κναφείῳ<sup>22\*</sup> τινὶ καὶ γενέσθαι καὶ τραφῆναι τὸν ἄνδρα λέγουσιν, οἱ δ' εἰς Τύλλων Ἀττίον ἀνάγουσι τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ γένους βασιλεύσαντα λαμπρῶς ἐν Οὐλοῦσcois καὶ πολεμήσαντα Ῥωμαίοις οὐκ ἀδυνάτως κ.τ.λ.

The source of this passage cannot have been Nepos or Tiro, to the latter of whom it has been customary, by a sort of general consent, to relegate these purely biographical portions of Plutarch's *vita*. This is not only impossible on the face of its very contents, but is sufficiently indicated by the οἱ μὲν . . . οἱ δὲ. On the other hand, the passage under notice possesses the true *color Suetonianus*.<sup>23</sup>

But even allowing this inference to be of too subjective a nature to compel conviction, all doubt as to its truth is again dispelled by two passages in *Hieronymus* and *Sextus Aurelius Victor*. I must quote them again for the purpose of comparison with the Greek cited above.

<sup>22\*</sup> This same reproach is made by Calenus, an inveterate enemy of Cicero's (cf. ad Att. XI. 8, 2, etc.), in a scurrilous speech put into his mouth by Dio 46, 4. The genuine oration, to which we may add the invectives of Antony as in all probability containing similar imputations, were undoubtedly known to Suetonius, whereas Plutarch unquestionably read neither.

<sup>23</sup> H. T. Peck, *Suetonius, Lives of the Caesars*, Holt & Co., New York, 1889, p. X.: "He can only accumulate with patient industry a vast number of details, and set them before us in a mass, leaving us to arrange and weigh and discriminate and judge as best we may. He is a gatherer of facts. . . . Nothing is too unpleasant, nothing too personal, to be left unrecorded. He pins a scandal and adds it to his collection, as a naturalist would a butterfly; but at the same time he does not dwell upon these matters."

*Hieron.* (i.e. *Suetonius*) Olym. 168, 3: *Cicero Arpius nascitur matre Helvia*,<sup>24</sup> *patre equestris ordinis ex rege Volscorum genere.*

*Victor de vir. ill.* 81 — *M. Tullius genere Arpinas patre equite Romano natus genus a Tullo*<sup>25</sup> *rege duxit.*

Plutarch's indebtedness to *Suetonius' Life of Cicero* having thus been demonstrated by the aid of Hieronymus and Sextus Aurelius Victor, we are now at liberty to look for additional evidence, corroborative of this indebtedness, and fortunately such passages are by no means lacking.

At the end of ch. 4 we are told that Apollonius on hearing Cicero, his pupil, declaim in Greek, cried out in despair that now eloquence too, the only glory that still remained to Greece, would be transferred by him to Rome.<sup>26</sup> The story is intrinsically improbable. It is nowhere alluded to by Cicero, certainly a very suspicious circumstance in his case, for he of all men would have been the least likely to have omitted to speak of it had it been true. Neither Valerius Maximus nor Gellius nor Macrobius nor any other writer of that stamp, in whose works we might reasonably expect to find so memorable an incident recorded, has any knowledge of it. There is, as a matter of fact, but *one other author* besides Plutarch who mentions it, and singularly enough his name is *Sextus Aurelius Victor*, in the *vita Ciceronis* so often quoted by me: "*Molonem Graecum rhetorem tum disertissimum habuit qui flesse dicitur quod per hunc Graecia eloquentiae laude privaretur.*"<sup>27</sup> Relying on the strength of the evidence already presented, we will not, I am confident, hesitate about designating *Suetonius* as the common source of *Plutarch* and *Victor* in this passage.

I have previously taken occasion to prove that in ch. 2, 22 sq., in which the poetry of Cicero is unfavorably criticised, Plutarch had

<sup>24</sup> The name of Cicero's mother is given only here and in Plut. She is never alluded to by Cicero, the solitary other reference being Q. Cicero Ep. ad Tironem (ad fam. XVI. 26, 2) "et matrem nostram sic olim facere memini."

<sup>25</sup> Cicero speaks of the antiquity of his family some three times: de leg. II. 1, 3; Brut. 16, 32; Tusc. I. 16, 38 (Servius Tullius).

<sup>26</sup> "Σὲ μὲν, ὦ Κικέρων, ἐπαινῶ καὶ θαυμάζω, τῆς δὲ Ἑλλάδος οἰκτεῖρω τὴν τύχην, ὁρῶν ἃ μόνα τῶν καλῶν ἡμῖν ὑπελείπετο καὶ ταῦτα Ῥωμαίοις διὰ σοῦ προσγενόμενα, παιδείαν καὶ λόγον."

<sup>27</sup> It might be mentioned in passing that a very similar anecdote is related of *John Reuchlin* and *Argyropolus*, whose lectures on Thucydides the German scholar took occasion to attend while an ambassador to the court of Pope Alex. VI.; cf. *Raumer*, Gesch. der Paedagogik, I. p. 95.

recourse to some post-Augustan source. *The same is true* of ch. 40, 4-24, in which he treats of Cicero's great merits in enriching the Latin language by the coinage of new words, and then again reverts to his *poetical efforts*. I do not, however, contend for source-identity because of any belief that the later chapter bears any internal evidence of a post-Augustan origin, for it does not, but simply because there can be no possible doubt that ch. 40, *on the very face of its contents*, is derived from the same fountain as ch. 2; and as this is necessarily post-Augustan and non-Tironian,<sup>28</sup> it follows that ch. 40, 4-24, is so too. But of all post-Augustan writers possibly accessible to Plutarch, there is not one to whom passages of this literary character can with more justice be attributed than to Suetonius Tranquillus, whose predilection on this point is well attested by innumerable examples. Adding to this the positive evidence already presented of Plutarch's indebtedness to Suetonius, the inference just made as to the source of ch. 2, 22 and ch. 40, 4-24, will be well-nigh irresistible.

I have purposely reserved for the last the discussion of one other passage which is calculated to give additional confirmation, if such, indeed, be needed, to the argument which I have been advocating in this paper. In ch. 44 the biographer narrates a dream of Cicero's which is practically and substantially identical with Cicero's dream concerning Augustus, as recorded by *Suetonius* (Aug. c. 94). Neither writer mentions his authority, the commentators on Suetonius are silent in regard to it, and the scholars who have written on the sources of the Greek *vita* attribute such passages to Tiro, in want of anything better, a proceeding, by the way, as easy as it is gratuitous. And yet the original source of this anecdote can be determined with singular accuracy from a passage of *Tertullian de anima*, c. 46: "M. Tullius Cicero Augustum civilium turbinum cultorem *de somnio* narrat quod in *vite illius commentariis* conditum est." There is every probability that this dream was also related in Suetonius' *Life of Cicero*, which, if true, might well account for the succinct narrative of it in his *Life of Augustus*. But if so, the question at once suggests itself, whether the *ὑπομνήματα* of Augustus constituted the common source of both Plutarch and Suetonius, or whether the latter author is again to be looked upon as the source of the former. Though not disposed categorically to assert what can never be fully substantiated by proof,

<sup>28</sup> That ch. 40 is not dependent upon Tiro's work, as has been almost unanimously assumed by scholars, is plainly indicated by the *ὡς φασιν* (line 12) and the *λέγεται* (line 18 Sint).

I am nevertheless very much inclined to favor the second view ; for, although Plutarch quotes these Memoirs five times in all (see the list above), there is but a very remote probability of his having ever read a single line of them, except at second hand, while Suetonius, on the contrary, is known to have made an extensive use of the emperor's autobiography.<sup>29</sup>

With this I close my paper, which I am only sorry to say is not nearly so carefully elaborated as I would like to have made it, if more time and space had been allotted to me. But be this as it may, its object will be more than accomplished if the philological jury, into whose hands the case is now given, should decide that the arguments adduced to prove that Suetonius' *vita Ciceronis* constituted one of the sources of Plutarch's life of the great Roman orator are at least formidable enough to merit attention, if not absolutely convincing.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Among other passages *possibly* taken from Suetonius might be mentioned c. 5, 29, 12 sq.; 41, 1, especially c. 24, and particularly some highly unfavorable criticisms of Cicero that are met with in Plutarch's life (omitting similar expressions in the narrative of the orator's political history, the sources of which were not discussed in this paper), for most of these are of so unfriendly a nature as to exclude Nepos, or Tiro as possible sources, their biographies being entirely eulogistic or apologetic.

<sup>30</sup> A possible chronological objection, which, if valid, would strike at the very root of my arguments, may be briefly discussed in a note, it being easily disposed of. Plutarch's *Life of Cicero* was written at a *later* date than his *Life of Sulla* (cf. Michaelis de ordine vitarum parall. Plutarchi, Berlin, 1875, Weber, p. 1-39). Now, the latter happily furnishes us with a "terminus post quem," for in ch. 21 Plutarch, describing the battle of Orchomenus, fought in 85 B.C., adds that many relics of the dead were found in the neighboring marshes, *σχεδὸν ἐτῶν διακοσίων ἀπὸ τῆς μάχης ἐκείνης διαγεγονότων*. This brings us down to the year 115 A.D. (cf. Holden, Plutarch's Sulla, p. xxiv.). The *vita Ciceronis* was consequently composed later than this date.

*Suetonius Tranquillus* is generally supposed to have been born about 75 A.D.; he was appointed *magister epistolarum* to Hadrian, probably in 119. He was, therefore, at the time of the composition of Plutarch's Cicero, some forty years old. There is consequently nothing to prevent us from supposing that his work, *De viris illustribus*, or parts of it, had at that time long been published, there being absolutely no evidence to the contrary. Pliny the Younger, in a letter (V. 10) probably written in 105 A.D., begs S. to publish his *volumina*. The *Caesares* are undoubtedly his latest, as they are his maturest, work.

## APPENDIX.

SEXTII AURELII VICTORIS VITAE CICERONIS [EPITOME] (*de Viris Illustribus*, c. 81).

Marcus Tullius Cicero genere Arpinas, patre equite Romano natus genus a Tito Tatio rege duxit.<sup>1</sup> Adolescens Rosciano iudicio eloquentiam et libertatem suam adversus Sullanos ostendit ex quo veritus invidiam Athenas studiorum gratia petivit<sup>2</sup> ubi Antiochum Academicum philosophum studiose audivit.<sup>3</sup> Inde eloquentiae gratia Asiam post Rhodum petiit<sup>4</sup> ubi Molonem Graecum rhetorem tum disertissimum magistrum habuit qui flesse dicitur quod per hunc Graecia eloquentiae laude privaretur.<sup>5</sup> Quaestor Siciliam habuit.<sup>6</sup> Praetor Ciliciam latrociniis liberavit.<sup>7</sup> Consul coniuratos capites punivit.<sup>8</sup> Mox invidia P. Clodii<sup>9</sup> instinctuque Caesaris<sup>10</sup> et Pompeii quos dominationis suspectos eadem qua quondam Sullanos libertate perstrinxerat, sollicitatis Pisone et Gabinio css. qui Macedoniam Syriamque provincias<sup>11</sup> in stipendium operae huius acceperant in exsilium<sup>12</sup> actus mox ipso referente Pompeio<sup>13</sup> rediit eumque civili bello secutus est.<sup>14</sup> Quo victo veniam a Caesare ultro accepit<sup>15</sup> quo interfecto Augustum fovit.<sup>16</sup> Antonium hostem indicavit.<sup>17</sup> Et cum Triumviros se fecissent Caesar, Lepidus Antoniusque<sup>18</sup> concordia non aliter visa est inter eos iungi posse nisi Tullius necaretur<sup>19</sup> qui immis-  
sis ab Antonio percussoribus<sup>20</sup> cum forte Formiis quiesceret imminens exitium corvi<sup>21</sup> auspicio didicit et fugiens<sup>22</sup> occisus est. Caput ad Antonium relatum.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Plut. Cic. c. 1 S. Hieron. l.c.<sup>2</sup> Plut. Cic. c. 3 Hieron. l.c.<sup>3</sup> Cic. c. 4, init.<sup>4</sup> Cic. c. 4, 24.<sup>5</sup> Cic. c. 4, 26.<sup>6</sup> Cic. c. 6.<sup>7</sup> Cic. c. 36, 14.<sup>8</sup> Cic. c. 10-23.<sup>9</sup> Cic. c. 28 sq.<sup>10</sup> Cic. c. 30, 30.<sup>11</sup> Cic. c. 30, 25.<sup>12</sup> Cic. c. 31 sq.<sup>13</sup> Cic. c. 33.<sup>14</sup> Cic. c. 37.<sup>15</sup> Cic. c. 39.<sup>16</sup> Cic. c. 40, 24.<sup>17</sup> Cic. c. 45, 30.<sup>18</sup> Cic. c. 46, 22.<sup>19</sup> Cic. c. 46, 26.<sup>20</sup> Cic. c. 47, 48.<sup>21</sup> Cic. c. 47, etiam Val. Max. 19, 15

[“cum enim in villa Caietana esset corvus in conspectu eius hororum mansit.”]

<sup>22</sup> Cic. c. 48, 49.